

Remarks

In response to the Office Action dated August 21, 2007, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendment and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-41 are currently pending and stand rejected.

Interview Summary

The undersigned participated in a telephone interview with the Examiner on October 11, 2007. During the interview, claim recitations not specifically addressed or addressed in an unintended manner were discussed. It was discussed that claims reciting the assigning of numeric options were for referring to the user assigning a number to an option, not the selection of the option for purposes of transcribing the message. It was discussed that claims recited selecting the numeric option to transcribe the message as separate language such that the assigning of the numeric options was a different claim element with a different meaning. It was discussed that the amendments made in the response filed on November 29, 2006 are not addressed in the current Office Action, such as the recitations in relation to a plurality of ports added to claims 10, 18, 25, and 30.

103 Rejections

Claims 1-9, 18-24, and 37-41 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Ortega (US Pat 6,535,848) in view of Luzeski (US Pat 6,430,177) and taken in further view of Iwase (US Pat Pub 2002/0097262). Claims 10-17, 25-29, 31, and 32 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega in view of Iwase and in further view of Padmanabhan (US Pat 6,219,638). Claims 30 and 34-36 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega in view of Iwase. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Applicant could not find a specific reference to claim 33 in the rejections, however, it would appear that the Office Action intended to reject claim 33 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega in view of Iwase and in further view of

Padmanabhan since section 12 refers to Padmanabhan disclosing email as the storing device.

Claims 1, 8, 18, and 37

These claims recite similar subject matter regarding recipient-designated assignments of numeric options to archival devices. None of the cited references, particularly Ortega, Luzeski, and Iwase describe these recitations. As has been conceded, Ortega does not describe such assignment of numeric options to archival devices. It has been asserted that Luzeski discloses access to universal messaging via a web browser. It has been further asserted that Iwase discloses a system for choosing peripheral devices by providing numeric options to the user.

Applicants assert that while Luzeski may provide a web based universal messaging system and while Iwase may provide numeric options for a user to choose a peripheral, none of these references disclose receiving recipient-designated assignments of numeric options to archival devices. As discussed with the Examiner, the assignment of numeric options to archival devices is different than choosing an archival device to transcribe a message. The assignment of the recipient-designated numeric options pertains to the recipient configuring the system by assigning a numeric option to an archival device so that when that numeric option is later selected, then the archival device assigned to that numeric option will be employed.

Indeed, in addition to the receiving of the recipient-designated assignments of numeric options to archival devices, claims 1, 8, 1, and 37 further recite that the user is prompted to select one of the numeric options and a selection of one of the numeric options is received from the recipient to transcribe the recorded message and provide it to the archival device corresponding to the chosen numeric option. Thus, the receiving of recipient-designated assignments of numeric options to archival devices is different than the selection of the numeric option to cause the message to be provided to an archival device corresponding to the chosen numeric option.

Therefore, even if the cited references do disclose receiving selection of a numeric option to select a peripheral for some purpose, the references do not disclose that recipient-designated assignments of numeric options to archival devices have been

received. Therefore, the combination of references fails to disclose all of the recitations of claims 1, 8, 18, and 37.

Furthermore, in addition to those reasons above, it appears that one of ordinary skill in the art would not reasonably be expected to look to Luzeski when modifying Ortega. Notably, Luzeski is for providing a universal inbox that captures various message types such that Luzeski then provides the message back to the user in the appropriate format for the message type, such as displaying email of the inbox versus providing audio playback of the voicemail of the inbox. Furthermore, to the extent Luzeski does any conversion, such as to provide email headers over a telephone call where the recipient has dialed into the system, the conversion is done on the basis of that device being used to access the system rather than the user selecting a numeric option corresponding to an output device. Thus, one of ordinary skill would not look to Luzeski when attempting to modify Ortega to achieve what is claimed.

Also in addition to those reasons above, it appears that one of ordinary skill in the art would also not reasonably be expected to look to Iwase when modifying Ortega. Iwase pertains to the connectivity of a portable device to one or more multi-function peripherals. While Iwase discloses that the user of the portable device is provided by an option to select one of the available multi-function peripherals to perform one of the multiple functions available, there is no availability of transcription on the basis of selecting a numeric option, as neither the portable device nor the multi-function peripheral (MFP) provides for any transcription and it is not readily apparent from Iwase as to how such transcription might occur in connection with the selection of a numeric option from the portable device, since only the non-transcribing MFP produces any output on the basis of the selections on the non-transcribing portable device. Thus, one of ordinary skill would not look to Iwase when attempting to modify Ortega to achieve what is claimed.

Therefore, for these several independent and cumulative reasons, claims 1, 8, 18, and 37 are allowable over the cited combination of references. Furthermore, dependent claims 2-7, 9, 19-24, and 38-41 are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 18 further recites that there are a plurality of ports of the transcribing means for directly interfacing the transcribing means to each of the plurality of archival

means, each of the ports being associated with the assigned numeric options. None of Ortega, Luzeski, and Iwase disclose such recitations. Iwase has no transcription means. While Luzeski may convert in some instance, such as to provide email headers over a phone call, Luzeski also does not have a transcription device with ports associated with assigned numeric options. It has already been conceded that Ortega lacks numeric options altogether. Therefore, claim 18 is allowable over the cited combination for at least these additional reasons.

Claims 10, 25

These claims include recitations similar to those discussed above regarding recipient-designated assignments of numeric options, and prompting for and receiving a selection of the assigned numeric option. Padmanabhan also fails to disclose these recitations as Padmanabhan is not concerned with such recipient-designated numeric options. Thus, these claims are allowable over the combination of Ortega in view of Iwase and further in view of Padmanabhan for at least the same reasons discussed above.

Furthermore, these claims include recitations similar to claim 18, discussed above, regarding ports of a converting device that are associated with the assigned numeric options. Padmanabhan also fails to disclose these recitations as Padmanabhan is not concerned with associations of recipient-designated numeric options to ports of a converting device. Thus, these claims are allowable over the combination of Ortega in view of Iwase for the additional reasons discussed above for claim 18.

Dependent claims 11-17 and 26-29 depend from allowable base claims and are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 30

Claim 30 includes recitations similar to those discussed above in relation to recipients assigning numeric options to archival devices where the numeric options are associated with ports interconnecting a converting device to the archival devices and in relation to prompting for a numeric option and receiving a numeric option in response to transcribe and archive a message.

As discussed above, neither Ortega nor Iwase disclose these recitations. Therefore, claim 30 is allowable over Ortega in view of Iwase for at least these same reasons. Dependent claims 31-36 depend from an allowable base claim and are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

Applicants assert that the application including claims 1-41 is in condition for allowance. Applicants request reconsideration in view of the amendments and remarks above and further request that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 16, 2007

/Jeramie J. Keys/
Jeramie J. Keys
Reg. No. 42,724

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, Ga 30007-1355
(404) 849.2093